
A Brief History of Economics: An Outsider's Account

Bikas K Chakrabarti

Theoretical Condensed Matter Physics Division and Centre for Applied Mathematics and Computational Science, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF, Bidhannagar, Kolkata 700 064, India.
`bikask.chakrabarti@saha.ac.in`

Summary. A dangerously brief history of the developments of the main ideas in economics, as observed by a physicist, is given. This was published in *Econophysics of Stock and Other Markets*, Eds. A. Chatterjee, B. K. Chakrabarti, New Economic Windows Series, Springer, Milan, 2006, pp 219-224.

When physics started to develop, say with Galileo Galelei (1564-1642), there were hardly any science at a grown-up stage to get help or inspiration from. The only science that was somewhat grown up was mathematics, which is an analytical science (based on logic) and not synthetic (based on observations/ experiments carried out in controlled environments or laboratories). Yet, developments in mathematics, astronomical studies in particular, had a deep impact in the development of physics, of which the (classical) foundation was almost single-handedly laid down by Isaac Newton (1643-1727) in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Mathematics remained at the core of physics since then. The rest of “main stream” sciences, like chemistry, biology etc all tried to get inspiration from, utilize, and compare with physics since then.

To my mind, development in social sciences started much later. Even the earliest attempt to model an agricultural economy in a kingdom, the “physiocrats’ model”, named after the profession of its pioneer, the french royal physician Francois Quesnay (1694-1774), came in the third quarter of the eighteenth century when physics was already put on firm ground by Newton. The physiocrats made the observation that an economy consists of the components like land and farmers, which are obvious. Additionally, they identified the other components as investment (in the form of seeds from previous savings) and protection (during harvest and collection, by the landlord or the king). The impact of the physical sciences, in emphasizing these observations regarding components of an economy, is clear. The analogy with human physiology then suggested that, like the healthy function of a body requiring proper functioning of each of its components or organs and the (blood) flow among them

remaining uninterrupted, each component of the economy should be given proper care (suggesting rent for land and tax for protection!). Although the physiocrats' observations were appreciated later, the attempt to conclude using the analogy with human physiology was not.

Soon, at their last phase, Mercantilists, like Wilhelm von Hornick (1638-1712), James Stewart (1712-1780) et al, made some of the most profound and emphatic observations in economics, leading to the foundation of political economy. In particular, the observations by the British merchants (who traded in the colonies, including India, in their own set terms) that instability/unemployment growing at their home country in years whenever there had been a net trade deficit and out-flow of gold (export being less than import). This led to the formulation of the problem of effective demand: even though the merchants, or traders were independently trading (exporting or importing goods) with success, the country's economy as a whole did not do well due to lack of overall demand when there was a net flow of gold (the international exchange medium) to balance the trade deficit! This remains still a major problem in macroeconomics. The only solution in those days was to introduce tax on import: the third party (namely the government) intervention on individuals' choice of economic activity (trade). This immediately justified the involvement of the government in the economic activities of the individuals.

In a somewhat isolated but powerful observation, Thomas Malthus (1766-1834) made a very precise modelling of the conflict between agricultural production and population growth. He assumed that the agricultural production can only grow (linearly) with the area of the cultivated land. With time t , say year, the area can only grow linearly ($\propto t$) or in arithmetic progression (AP). The consumption depends on the population which, on the other hand, grows exponentially ($\exp[t]$) or in geometric progression (GP). Hence, with time, or year 1, 2, 3, ..., the agricultural production grows as 1, 2, 3, ..., while the consumption demand or population grows in a series like 2, 4, 8, ... No matter, how much large area of cultivable land we start with, the population GP series soon takes over the food production AP series and the population faces a disaster — to be settled with famine, war or revolution! They are inevitable, as an exponentially growing function will always win over a linearly growing function and such disasters will appear almost periodically in time!

Adam Smith (1723-1790) made the first attempt to formulate the economic science. He painstakingly argued that a truly many-body system of selfish agents, each having no idea of benevolence or charity towards its fellow neighbours, or having no foresight (views very local in space and time), can indeed reach an equilibrium where the economy as a whole is most efficient; leading to the best acceptable price for each commodity. This 'invisible hand' mechanism of the market to evolve towards the 'most efficient' (beneficial to *all* participating agents) predates by ages the demonstration of 'self-organisation' mechanism in physics or chemistry of many-body systems, where each constituent cell or automata follows very local (in space and time) dynamical rules and yet the collective system evolves towards a globally 'organised' pattern (cf. Ilya Prigogine (1917-), Per Bak (1947-2002) et al). This idea of 'self-organizing or self-correcting economy' by Smith of course contradicted the prescription of the Mercantilists regarding government intervention in the economic activities of the individuals, and argued tampering by any external agency to be counterproductive.

Soon, the problem of price or value of any commodity in the market became a central problem. Following David Ricardo's (1772-1823) formulation of rent and

labour theory of value, where the price depends only on the amount of labour put by the farmers or labourers, Karl Marx (1818-1883) formulated and forwarded emphatically the surplus labour theory of value or wealth in any economy. However, none of them could solve the price paradox: why diamond is costly, while coal is cheap? The amount of labour in mining etc are more or less the same for both. Yet, the prices are different by astronomical factors! This clearly demonstrates the failure of the labour theory of value. The alternative forwarded was the utility theory of price: the more the utility of a commodity, the more will be its price. But then, how come a bottle of water costs less than a bottle of wine? Water is life and certainly has more utility! The solution identified was marginal utility. According to marginal utility theory, not the utility but rather its derivative with respect to the quantity determines the price: water is cheaper as its marginal utility at the present level of its availability is less than that for wine — will surely change in a desert. This still does not solve the problem completely. Of course increasing marginal utility creates increasing demand for it, but its price must depend on its supply (and will be determined by equating the demand with the supply)! If the offered (hypothetical) price p of a commodity increases, the supply will increase and the demand for that commodity will decrease. The price, for which supply S will be equal to demand D , will be the market price of the commodity: $S(p) = D(p)$ at the market (clearing) price. However, there are problems still. Which demand should be equated to which supply? It is not uncommon to see often (in India) that price as well as the demand for rice (say) increases simultaneously. This can occur when the price of the other staple alternative (wheat) increases even more.

The solutions to these problems led ultimately to the formal development of economic science in the early twentieth century by Léon Walras (1834-1910), Alfred Marshall (1842-1924) and others: marginal utility theory of price and cooperative or coupled (in all commodities) demand and supply equations. These formulations went back to the self-organising picture of any market, as suggested by Adam Smith, and incorporated this marginal utility concept, and utilized these coupled demand-supply equations: $D_i(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_i, \dots, p_N, M) = S_i(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_i, \dots, p_N, M)$ for N commodities and total money M in the market, each having relative price tags p_i (determined by marginal utility rankings) and demand D_i and supply S_i ; $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and the functions D or S are in general nonlinear in their arguments. These formal and abstract formulations of economic science were not appreciated very much in its early days and had a temporary setback. The lack of acceptance was due to the fact that neither utility nor marginal utility is measurable and the formal solutions of these coupled nonlinear equations in many (p_i) variables still remain elusive. The major reason for the lack of appreciation for these formal theories was a profound and intuitive observation by John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946) on the fall of aggregate (or macroeconomic) effective demand in the market (as pointed out earlier by the Mercantilists; this time due to 'liquidity preference' of money by the market participants) during the great depression of 1930's. His prescription was for government intervention (in direct contradiction with the 'laissez-faire' ideas of leaving the market to its own forces to bring back the equilibrium, as Smith, Walras et al proposed) to boost aggregate demand by fiscal measures. This prescription made immediate success in most cases. By the third quarter of the twentieth century, however, its failures became apparent and the formal developments in microeconomics took the front seat again.

Several important, but isolated observations in the meantime contributed later very significantly. Vilfredo Pareto (1848-1923) observed that the number density $P(m)$ of riches in any society decreases rather slowly with their richness m (measured in those days by palace sizes, number of horses, etc of the kings/landlords in all over Europe): $P(m) \sim m^{-\alpha}$; for very large m (very rich people); $2 < \alpha < 3$ (Cours d'Economie Politique, Lausanne, 1897). It may be mentioned, at almost the same time, Josiah Willard Gibbs (1839-1903) had put forward precisely that the number density $P(\epsilon)$ of particles (or microstates) with energy ϵ in a thermodynamic ensemble in equilibrium at temperature T falls off much faster: $P(\epsilon) \sim \exp[-\epsilon/T]$ (Elementary Principles of Statistical Mechanics, 1902). This was by then rigorously established in physics. The other important observation was by Louis Bachelier (1870-1946) who modelled the speculative price fluctuations (σ), over time τ , using a Gaussian statistics (for random walk): $P(\sigma) \sim \exp[-\sigma^2/\tau]$ (Thesis: Théorie de la Spéculation, Paris, 1900). This actually predated Albert Einstein's (1879-1955) random walk theory (1905) by five years. In another isolated development, mathematician John von Neumann (1903-1957) started developing the game theories for microeconomic behavior of partners in oligopolistic competitions (to take care of the strategy changes by agents, based on earlier performance).

In the mainstream economics, Paul Samuelson (1915-) investigated the dynamic stabilities of demand-supply equilibrium by formulating, following Newton's equations of motion in mechanics, dynamical equations $\frac{dD_i}{dt} = \sum_j J_{ij} D_j(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N, M)$ and $\frac{dS_i}{dt} = \sum_j K_{ij} S_j(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N, M)$, with the demand and supply (overlap) matrices $\underline{J}$ and $\underline{K}$ respectively for N commodities, and by looking for the equilibrium state(s) where $dS/dt = 0 = dD/dt$ at the market clearing prices $\{p\}$ where $D_i(\{p\}, M) = S_i(\{p\}, M)$. Jan Tinbergen (1903-1994), a statistical physicist (student of Paul Ehrenfest of Leiden University) analysed the business cycle statistics and initiated the formulation of econometrics. By this time, these formal developments in economics, with clear impact of other developed sciences (physics in particular), were getting recognized. In fact, Tinbergen was the first recipient of the newly instituted Nobel prize in Economics in 1969 (for other sciences, they started in 1901; a delay by 68 years in 105 years' history of the prize!) and the next year, the prize went to Samuelson. Soon, the formal developments like the axiomatic foundations of utility (ranking) theory, and solution of general equilibrium theory by Kenneth Arrow (1921-), those of George Stigler (1911-1991), who first performed Monte Carlo simulations of markets (similar to those of thermodynamic systems in physics), or that of John Nash (1928-), giving the proof of the existence of equilibrium solutions in strategic games, etc, all were appreciated by awarding the Nobel prizes in economics (in 1972, 1982 and 1994 respectively). Although the impact of developments in physics had a clear mark in those of economics so far, it was not that explicit until about a decade and a half back.

The latest developments (leading to econophysics) had of course its seed in several earlier observations. Important among them was by Benoit Mandelbrot (1924-) when he observed in 1963 that the speculative fluctuations (in the cotton market for example) have a much slower rate of decay, compared to that suggested by the Gaussian statistics of Bachelier, and falls down following a power law statistics: $P(\sigma) \sim \sigma^{-\alpha}$ with some robust exponent value (α) depending on the time scale of observations. With the enormous amount of stock market data now available on the internet, Eugene Stanley, Rosario Mantegna and coworkers established firmly the above mentioned (power-law) form of the stock price fluctuation statistics in

late 1990's. Simultaneously, two important modelling efforts, inspired directly from physics, started: the minority game models, for taking care of contagious behavior (in contrast to perfect rational behavior) of agents in the market, and learning from the past performance of the strategies, were developed by Brian Arthur, Damien Challet, Yi-Cheng Zhang et al, starting 1994. The other modelling effort was to capture the income or wealth distribution in society, similar to energy distributions in (ideal) gases. These models intend to capture both the initial Gamma/log-normal distribution for the income distributions of poor and middle-income groups and also the Pareto tail of the distribution for the riches. It turned out, as shown by the Kolkata group during the last half of 1990 to the first half of 2000, a random saving gas model can easily capture these features of the distribution function. However, the model had several well documented previous, somewhat incomplete, versions available for a long time. Meghnad Saha (1893-1956), the founder of Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata (named so after its founder's death), and collaborators, already discussed at length in their text book, in the 1950's, the possibility of using Maxwell-Boltzmann velocity distribution (a Gamma distribution) in an ideal gas to represent the income distribution in societies: "suppose in a country, the assessing department is required to find out the average income per head of the population. They will proceed somewhat in the similar way ... (the income distribution) curve will have this shape because the number of absolute beggars is very small, and the number of millionaires is also small, while the majority of the population have average income." (section on 'Distribution of velocities' in *A Treatise on Heat*, M. N. Saha and B. N. Srivastava, Indian Press, Allahabad, 1950; pp. 132-134). This modelling had the obvious drawback that the distribution could not capture the Pareto tail. However, the accuracy of this Gibbs distribution for fitting the income data available now in the internet has been pointed out recently by Victor Yakovenko and collaborators in a series of papers since 2000. The 'savings' ingredient in the ideal-gas model, required for getting the Gamma function form of the otherwise ideal gas (Gibbs) distribution, was also discovered more than a decade earlier by John Angle. He employed a different driver in his stochastic model of inequality process. This inequality coming mainly from the stochasticity, together with the equivalent of saving introduced in the model. A proper Pareto tail of the Gamma distribution comes naturally in this class of models when the saving propensity of the agents are distributed, as noted first by the Kolkata group and analyzed by them and by the Dublin group led by Peter Richmond.

Apart from the intensive involvements of physicists together with a few economists in this new phase of development, a happy feature has been that econophysics has almost established itself as a (popular) research discipline in statistical physics. Many physics journals have started publishing papers in such an interdisciplinary field. Also, courses in econophysics are being offered in several universities, mostly in their physics departments.

In spite of all these, it must be stated that there has, so far, been no spectacular success. Indeed, the mainstream economists are yet to take note of these developments. In her account, reporting on the *Econophys-Kolkata I* (New Scientist, UK, 12 March 2005 issue, pp.6-7), Jenny Hogan reported several criticisms by economists, mostly appreciating the observations, but not the modelling efforts! The same kind of criticism have recently been expressed more emphatically by economists Mauro Gallegati, Thomas Lux and others (<http://www.unifr.ch/econophysics/doc/0601001>; *Physica A* in press). We have included a few responses by physicists like Peter Rich-

mond and social statistician like John Angle in this volume. Economist J Barkley Rosser, in his intriguing reflections (in the following paper) on these new developments of econophysics, detects the same stories of the past becoming present, predicting the future of econophysics to become a past story of economics soon!

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Anindya-Sundar Chakrabarti and Arnab Chatterjee for careful reading of this manuscript and useful criticisms.